## PATENT COOPERATION TREA

**PCT** 

REC'D 07 JUL 2005

## INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

			·					
1 .	cant's or agent's file reference 0868 WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Form PCT/IPEA/416						
l .	national application No. I/IB2004/002345	International filing date (c	lay/month/year)	Priority date (day/fionth/year) 23.07.2003	)			
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC H04N7/167								
Applicant AXALTO SA et al.								
.1.	This report is the international particle 35 and tr	reliminary examination repansmitted to the applicant	oort, established by t according to Article	his International Preliminary E 36.	xamining			
2.	2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.							
з.	This report is also accompanied	by ANNEXES, comprising	g:					
l	a. $\square$ sent to the applicant and	to the International Burea	u) a total of sheets	, as follows:				
	sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).							
	sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box.							
	b.   (sent to the International Bureau only) a total of (indicate type and number of electronic carrier(s)), containing a sequence listing and/or tables related thereto, in computer readable form only, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see Section 802 of the Administrative Instructions).							
4.	This report contains indications	relating to the following it	ems:					
	☐ Box No. I Basis of the o	pinion						
	☐ Box No. II Priority							
	☐ Box No. III Non-establish	ment of opinion with rega	rd to novelty, inventi	ve step and industrial applicab	oility			
	☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity	of invention						
	⊠ Box No. V Reasoned state     applicability; capability;	tement under Article 35(2 citations and explanations	<ul> <li>with regard to nove supporting such sta</li> </ul>	elty, inventive step or industria tement	l			
1	Box No. VI Certain docui							
1		ts in the international app						
	☑ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application							
Dat	e of submission of the demand		Date of completion o	f this report				
10.	.12.2004		06.07.2005					
Name and mailing address of the international			Authorized Officer		nes Patere			
preliminary examining authority:  European Patent Office D-80298 Munich			Telephone No. +49 8		See Miles			
-	Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 52 Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465	23656 epmu d	SCHOJE	R	The state on the state of the s			

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No. PCT/IB2004/002345

	Box	ox No. I Basis of the report			
1.	. With regard to the <b>language</b> , this report is based on the international application in the language in which filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.				
		which is the language of a trans  international search (under F  publication of the internation	ions from the original language into the following language, slation furnished for the purposes of: Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)) nal application (under Rule 12.4) amination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)		
2.	. With regard to the <b>elements*</b> of the international application, this report is based on <i>(replacement sheets wh have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report):</i>				
	Des	escription, Pages			
	1-9	9 as	s originally filed		
	Cla	Claims, Numbers			
1-10 as originally filed  Drawings, Sheets		10 as	s originally filed		
		rawings, Sheets			
	1/2	2-2/2 as	s originally filed		
		l a sequence listing and/or any r	related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing		
3.		The amendments have resulte  ☐ the description, pages ☐ the claims, Nos. ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs ☐ the sequence listing (specification) ☐ any table(s) related to sequence	······································		
4		This report has been establish ad not been made, since they have supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).  ☐ the description, pages ☐ the claims, Nos. ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs ☐ the sequence listing (special pay table(s) related to sequence			
	*	If item 4 applies, some	e or all of these sheets may be marked "superseded."		

Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

2-7,10

Claims

1,9

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims 2-7,10 1-10

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims No:

Claims

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7):

see separate sheet

#### Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

#### Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

#### International application No.

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/IB2004/002345

Re Item V.

#### Prior art:

The following documents (D) are referred to in this communication; the numbering will be adhered to in the rest of the procedure:

D1: WO-A-0247356 D2: EP-A-1263230

D3: US-A1-2002048367

#### Novelty:

The present application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of present independent claim 1 and 9 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses a method and a system for monitoring the usage of a service by a communication device coupled to a tamper resistant module, comprising:

- a plurality of encrypted data flows
- successive decryption steps of the data flow by a first key, encrypted in the data flow and decrypted in the tamper resistant module (see D1 p. 9 l.17-21) by a second key, stored or derived in the tamper resistant module (see D1, p. 3, l.16-29; page 4, line 31 to page 7 line 19).

The method and system disclosed in D1 comprise a counting step to count the number of times the encryption key is decrypted and the amount of data flow, which has been decrypted (see D1, p. 8, l. 12-20).

The subject-matter of independent claim 9, referring to a module related to the method in independent claim 1 is also not new for the same reasons as set out above for independent claim 1.

#### Inventive step:

The present application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of independent claim 10 and of dependent claims 2-8 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

#### Claim 10:

The subject matter of independent claim 10 does not involve an inventive step, as it is obvious to a person skilled in the art that a computer program can be used to perform the counting step of the method defined in the subject-matter of independent claim 1.

#### Claim 2:

The subject-matter of claim 2, related to the storing of a predetermined fixed number in the tamper resistant module, the incrementation of a counter and the comparison of the counter number with a predetermined fixed number, is not inventive as in D1 p. 8, I. 12-20, it is disclosed a similar system, where the counter is decremented and compared to zero. Therefore the subject matter of dependent claim 2 is obvious for a person skilled in the art, aware of the description of D1 p. 8, I.12-20.

#### Claim 3:

The person skilled in the art, aware of D1, will also be aware of D3, p. 4, paragraph 58 and 59, where it is described a method including a command sent to the tamper resistant module for the renewing of the key.

#### Claim 4:

A method for updating, resetting the counter is described in D2 (col. 9, l.40 - col.10, l.11; D2 col. 15 l. 46- col. 16, l. 19)

#### Claim 5:

The command of dependent claim 3 and 4 is encrypted by a third key known in the tamper resistant module. This is described in D3 p. 3 paragraph 38 and page 4 paragraph 58-59 and also D2 col. 10, l.6-11.

#### Claim 6:

The subject matter of dependent claim 6 is also obvious, as it is obvious that the action undertaken after the comparison of the counter, is the completion of decryption steps.

#### Claim 7:

A periodical update of the first key is described in D3, page 4, paragraph 58.

#### Claim 8:

The subject matter of dependent claim 8 is obvious to a person skilled in the art, as it is obvious that commands are transmitted to the tamper resistant module and that there is

#### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/002345

a program for authorising the transmission that does not necessarily read the content.

Article 33(4) PCT: the subject-matter of claims 1-10 is considered to be industrially applicable.

Re Item Part VII.

Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in the documents D1-D3 are not mentioned in the description.

The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (Rule 6.2(b) PCT).

In order to facilitate the examination of the conformity of the amended application with the requirements of Article 34(2)(b) PCT, the applicant is re-quested to clearly identify the amendments carried out, no matter whether they concern amendments by addition, replacement or deletion, and to indicate the passages of the application as filed on which these amendments are based (see also Rule 66.8(a) PCT).

Re Item Part VIII.

The application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because the subject matter of independent claim 1 and of dependent claim 8 is not clear.

In particular, in claim 1 I.2 the tamper resistant module refers to a desired effect. Moreover, the wording of claim 1, I.15-16 is not clear, as it is not specified how the counter can prove the amount of data flow which has been decrypted.

It is not clear which subject matter the applicant intend to protect in dependent claim 8. In order to proceed with the examination, the examiner makes the assumption that the wording of the subject matter of dependent claim 8 means that a command can be transmitted to the tamper resistant module.